

MISSOURI STATE PENITENTIARY
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Open Session
June 22, 2005

Chairman Carr called the meeting called to order at 1:00 p.m.

The following Commission members were present: Bushmann, Carr, Schreiber, Sheehan, Wunderlich

The following commission members were absent: Callis, Mahfood, Meyer, Peerson, Riddick

- I. Presentations from Gallery – Margaret Conroy, Executive Director of the Missouri River Regional Library Board. Ms. Conroy announced that the MRRL Board voted to build a new library and they have chosen the MSPR site. Plans are to offer a referendum to the voters which will be on the April ballot in 2006. In the meantime, the board will be working with the Community and Architect to finalize plans to discuss cost, infrastructure, development, etc. Ms. Conroy sate that the board will make a formal request to address the MSPR at the August 22, 2004 meeting, with a more formal discussion.
- II. Conflict of Interest Policy – Counsel Pamela Henrickson
Ms. Henrickson stated that the current policy prohibits the commissioners from serving on another board or other entities having interest in acquiring property within the redevelopment area. The Commissioners wanted to adjust the policy in order to allow the members to be involved in another entity that wouldn't result in any financial gain to the entity. The policy was revised as follows:
Added language in Item #2
Contact information for the Division of Facilities Management, Design and Construction staff was also changed, due to the recent change in administration. The policy was acceptable to the present members; however, it was not formally adopted by vote because of lack of a quorum. It will be voted on at the next meeting.
- III. Insurance Coverage – Counsel Pamela Henrickson
Ms. Henrickson stated that she has spoken with both the Office of Administration (OA) Risk Management Unit and the Missouri Public Entity Risk Management (MoPERM) regarding coverage for the Commission members.
Under the new statute, members are covered for general liability and directors and officers liability under the legal expense fund, effective August 28, 2005.
MoPERM Coverage: You cannot purchase property insurance from MoPERM and allow the liability to stay with the legal expense fund because it is not sold that way. MoPERM purchases insurance on the open market and they have an available cap. The current cap and the amount insurable was not available. The representative who Ms. Henrickson spoke with was not able to give the cap or how much insurance MoPERM would offer to sell to the Commission.
Facts:
The facility has never been insured
No company has ever insured a facility of this kind

What would be insurance (MoPERM refuses to insure anything unoccupied; however, security staff is currently occupying space.)

The market appraisal is determined by the cost to reconstruct and 3 approaches to value

Operation Expenses: This facility does not apply, as it is not being used on a daily basis

Ms. Henrickson received an information report form, which she will complete on behalf of the Commission. It will be sent in to the actuary and underwriter. A response will be given as to what coverage is available and how much can be purchased. Ms. Henrickson also emphasized that the commissioners should consider and discuss what kind of insurance is needed.

Discussion:

Bushmann: Suggested that the two categories which are mostly needed are the directors and officers insurance and liability.

Sheehan: Asked if Ms. Henrickson will secure bids for ranges of costs and coverage for the buildings.

Henrickson: No. That is too formal a process. She will complete the informational report for MoPERM and ask them to respond whether or not the Commissioners circumstance meets the criteria to sell insurance and what that cost will be. If MoPERM determines they are unwilling or unable to sell property insurance to this Commission, coverage will have to be sought from the commercial market.

Schreiber: Specific replacement/refurbish coverage would need to be considered for the buildings that to be saved in case of a catastrophic event.

Sheehan: Would that hold true for the wall, in that maintenance is important to the security and integrity of the interior?

Henrickson: Yes. If insurance is purchased the wall would definitely want to be included in coverage. The reaction from insurance company was not favorable. Given the condition the wall is in now, no one is willing to commit.

Mosby: Is there a way the Commission could fall under the provision of the self insurance?

Henrickson I would have to review the statue. Insuring the property in its current condition is going to be far too expensive. If one unit were occupied, it would be helpful.

Carr: I believe the first step is to get the estimate, file the application with as much detail as possible and begin the process.

Henrickson: Yes. Hopefully, you will be able to purchase the liability from MoPERM, at a reasonable price.

IV. Historic Tours – Charlie Brzuchalski

The RFP for the Historic tours is very cumbersome. Mr. Mosby and I have had several conversations and we have come to the conclusion and recommend to you to include these tours as one of the tasks for the facilities maintenance contractor who will be hired as part of the master developer contract. In the original tourism RFP, janitorial, trash keeping, there were all kinds of housekeeping provisions that were not really germane to the tour activity itself.

We would pare down the tour activity to just tours and leave the housekeeping items and inside with the facility maintenance management personnel.

Discussion:

Sheehan: It does not need to be handled by the same party?

Brzuchalski: Separate but concurrent.

Carr: After having reviewed the RFP and seeing the variation of iteration, it seems practical for the site manager to take on that role.

V. Caretaking and Interim Use – David Mosby

Director Mosby commented that the staff person at the prison is doing an excellent job. He has been extremely accommodating to special groups who have requested tours. Summer help has been hired for grass cutting and maintaining the weed control.

VI. Facilities Management – Charlie Brzuchalski

At the last meeting questions were asked regarding the criteria that was gathered prior to the formulation of the Commission. Mr. Brzuchalski located the Redevelopment Entity Report, and provided a copy of that report to each of the members. This report was prepared by the Redevelopment Task Force prior to the creation of the MSPR Commission. The 3-parts include:

- types of entities: public, private and public private
- Case Studies: How other developers and redevelopment corporate entities have been created and how they function.
- Recommendation from Development Strategies, which was part of the consultant team, on how the Commission should be formed. HB621 (2000), which established the Commission was authored with this as a guide.

VI. Review of Project Status – Charlie Brzuchalski

a. Master Developer/Facilities Maintenance Selection Process

Mr. Brzuchalski explained the Qualification Based Selection process (QBS). The process is similar to the one used for the master planner. Once a Scope of Services is established letters of interest are sent, with a specified response date, to the persons who may potentially be interested in the property. It will include an abbreviated Scope of Services and a questionnaire about their company.

The selection panel will score and rank these firms according to the response received from each. From there, a long list is created and those firms are invited to an information meeting. At this meeting, the Scope of work is reviewed and the selection committee will evaluate their submitted qualifications. (Stating if they have Architect, Engineers, Accountants, Real Estate brokers, Facilities Management Services in house or will be subcontracting those services). Scores are based on questions shared with them at the information meeting.

When responses are received the Review Panel will review and score and rank again. The interviews are scheduled, the selection panel attends, observes the presentations, and scores accordingly. The final selection

recommendation for the Master Developer is ascertained and is presented to the Commission. Time frame is expected to be approximately 8-9 weeks.

Discussion:

Wunderlich: Asked who would be on the selection panel

Carr: Suggested Commissioners Schreiber, Sheehan, Bushmann, and FMDC staff members Johannpeter and Brzuchalski

Bushmann: Is this process subject to the state bidding requirement?

Henrickson: Under the law registered architects and engineers are procured through this procedure, not through a bid process. It is similar to what the state uses for selection.

Bushmann: Are there minority requirements?

Henrickson: There are not such statutory requirements

Mosby: Not at this point; however, there maybe be by that time.

Sheehan: Is it time to share the accomplishments of this commission to the Advisory Committee members or the community as a whole?

Brzuchalski: An Executive Advisory Committed meeting is scheduled some time in the Fall.

b. Jefferson City PUD Zoning Overlay Proposal

The development area is in an RS4 zoning because the inmates resided there. The city has concurred that this should be zoned as Planning Unit Development (PUD, RATHER THAN RS4. An application will need to be completed by the MSPR Commission and sent to the JC City Planning and Zoning Commission. That commission will schedule a public hearing, vote on the request and make a recommendation to the Council.

c. Chestnut Street Extension Project

The topographic and utility survey is complete. The conceptual design is completed by Parsons. The right-of-Way has been identified. They are working on the scoping, cost estimates and funding sources.

d. Rex Whitton Expressway Study

A public meeting by MoDOT and the Cole County Public Works, Jefferson City Community Development and George Butler Associates June 8 and 9, 2005. The basic content of the meeting was to develop a range of solutions for the expressway problem, and to receive input from attendees, including the public. The information received helps to obtain such information as demographics, traffic count, public concerns. This will be a lengthy process.

VII. Commission Logo

Several suggestions were made, such as 1) moving the wording to the bottom of the page 2) use the logo for stationery only, as the figures were not clear; therefore not identifiable 3) reconfigure and delete a couple figures so that there would be more room to make the remaining two figures more legible. 4) move lettering outside the oval and enlarge the figures inside 5) enlarge and use as a watermark
Chairman Carr suggested that if it cannot be made clear and attractive there should be no need to spend any more time on the task.

VIII. Other Business

Chairman Carr noted that no comments or suggestions were received from the members regarding the Pro Forma criteria; therefore, this list will be used for the Master Developer.

With no further business, a motion to close the Open Meeting was made by John Sheehan and seconded by Mark Schreiber
Those in favor: Bushmann, Carr, Schreiber, Sheehan, Wunderlich
Opposed: None
Absent: Callis, Mahfood, Meyer, Peerson, Riddick

These minutes were approved August 24, 2005